

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOHN REDMAN,) Case No. 2:12-cv-01516-APG-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)
vs.) **ORDER**
D.K. JENNINGS, et al.,) (Docket No. 84)
Defendant(s).)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend his copy work limit. Docket No. 84. Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 86. No reply was filed. The Court finds the motion properly resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed more fully below, the motion is hereby DENIED.

20 An inmate has no constitutional right to free photocopying. *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517,
21 521 (9th Cir. 1991). Pursuant to NDOC regulations, inmates can only accrue a maximum of \$100 debt
22 for copy work expenses for all cases. *See, e.g., Weddle v. Baker*, 2014 U.S. Dist. Lexis 151674, *3 (D.
23 Nev. Oct. 27, 2014). “In this district, courts have found that they can order a prison to extend limited
24 photocopying when it is necessary for an inmate to provide copies to the Court and other parties.” *Id.*
25 (citing *Allen v. Clark Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 31756 (D. Nev. Mar. 11, 2011)).

1 The pending motion merely indicates that Plaintiff has exhausted his allotted amount of copy
2 expenses. *See* Docket No. 8 at 2. The motion fails to explain how Plaintiff has used his copy expenses
3 thus far, what additional copywork is needed in relation to this case, and why other methods of copying
4 are not available (including handwriting copies or using carbon paper). Accordingly, the Court hereby
5 DENIES the motion.

6 || IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 || DATED: June 8, 2015


NANCY J. KOPPE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE